

I oppose loosening the rules designed to promote and protect diversity of media ownership. These rules were adopted to ensure that the public would receive a diverse range of viewpoints from the media, and not simply the opinions of a handful of media conglomerates.

I have several points I would like to further make.

Broadcast and cable media have other , unique and peripheral attributes that must be evaluated for a fuller understanding of the implications of the effects of the proposed rule changes.

What studies show that political diversity of opinion is improved by consolidating ownerships of broadcast and cable firms. What effect does media diversity in a community have on voter involvement and activity.

Mr. Powell's suggestion that the "explosion" of outlets has brought about more media diversity is flawed. Not all "outlets" are created equally, with equal access. Relegating the "minority" voice to a daytime talk show or internet website with limited public access is clearly not in the public interest. Is Mr. Powell suggesting that the FCC will give every household a computer for internet access a part of the Commission's proposed rule changes.

To prop up newspaper profitability and indeed viability by permitting cross-media ownership would be fine--if the owner could demonstrate diversity of editorial opinion. Where in the proposed rule changes are rules specifying the % of editorial diversity in a given market? Cox clearly hasn't demonstrated anything like this in Atlanta where they own the local cable company AND the AJC.

The timing is not right. Coming off massive media company corporate writeoffs one could argue that MORE regulation is necessary. With the massive media fraud and mismanagement taking place over the last 5 years in media companies such as WorldCom, Adelphia and TimeWarnerAOL (yes a \$50 billion writeoff constitutes a fraud in my opinion against the shareholders)WHY do we believe these firms will act "responsibly" in the common public citizen's (with small economic advocacy) interest. Please tell me why again?

We need to shine the glare of halogen lights, in full public view, on the issues, responsibilities and proposed rule changes by the Commission affecting these media companies today. The simple fact that these companies have so ardently lobbied for these changes and almost NOWHERE are these discussions, the proposed rule changes, the lobbying efforts and the potential ramifications addressed in full public view and debate by ANY of the media involved.

If I am an informed "citizen" because I have sought out a website (an equally footed media "outlet" with detailed information about the Commission's proposals, and I know some of the facts, is my "NO" on the proposed rule changes equal to 100,000 other non-informed citizen's votes? I think not. .. at least in the America I was brought up in.

Open the proposed changes to vigorous open debate before making any changes.